

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 6 have been respectively amended to include the limitations of claims 3 and 7, namely that the graphic command transferred to the 2D graphic device driver is a ROP3 graphics command.

The rejection of claims 1-9 is under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patrick (US006026239A) in view of Baldwin (US005764243A) and Bates (US006707457B1) is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Patrick, Baldwin, and Bates patents each fails to disclose or suggest, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, a 2D graphics accelerator that permits **ROP3** graphics commands to be executed, by having the graphic driver perform a **step of copying the source pixel and pattern for expansion and conversion, the ROP3 command being performed after the copying step.** This permits execution of ROP3 graphics commands even though the command register typically has only a single bit and cannot distinguish whether the source pixel or pattern is colored, thereby avoiding the need to convert the ROP3 command to a slower ROP2 command, as was done in the prior art.

In contrast, the Patrick discloses a run-time code compiler with a state machine for efficiently transferring a data block of bytes from a source to a destination in memory of a computer system, thereby enabling more efficient ROP execution, but fails to disclose any solution to the problem of being able to execute ROP graphics in the first place when the graphics chip does not provide sufficient color source information. Patrick assumes that the ROP graphics command can be executed and does not provide for, or require, copying of the claimed source pixel and pattern in order to carrying out expansion and conversion before ROP execution. Instead, for ROP execution, Patrick includes an at least two part logic operation and data transfer, which can improve data transfer but does not provide for complete ROP acceleration.

The Bates and Baldwin patents do not make up for the deficiencies of the Patrick patent. The Bates patent basically provides for caching of data to avoid the need to refer to the system member, but does not provide for delaying execution of a ROP command until after copying the source pixel and pattern when both are colored to enable expansion and conversion, as claimed. Similarly, the Baldwin patent is directed to 2D graphics acceleration by parallel processing of multi-pixel span fragments, and assumes that the processor will be able to distinguish a colored source pixel and pattern without providing for copying, expansion, and conversion of the color source pixel and pattern, as claimed, in case the processor cannot distinguish the color source pixel and pattern.

Because the Patrick, Bates, and Baldwin patents all fails to disclose or suggest the claimed execution of a ROP3 command after copying of a colored source pixel and pattern for expansion and conversion, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: May 23, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 683-0500